



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

for a text whenever he felt free to speak his mind upon the subject of war." In 1514 he says in a letter to the Abbot of St. Bertin: "What do you suppose the Turks will think of us when they hear of Christian princes falling out so furiously with one another, and that for a title to empire?" He informs us in one of his *Adagia*, itself a long dissertation on the evils of war, that when he was at Rome he had drawn up a treatise on war called "Antipolemus," inscribed to Julius II., and he speaks as if he intended to print it. No essay with this title appears among his published works; but it seems to me not unlikely that what he here meditated may have been included afterward in his "Complaint of Peace" in 1517. The dissertation referred to is introduced under the proverb *Dulce bellum in expertis*. The publication of the old English translation of it under the title "Antipolemus" causes some confusion. An American edition of this, together with the "Complaint of Peace," was published in 1813 (by Charles Williams, Boston, and D. Allinson, Burlington, N. J.). This is of great significance in the history of the American peace movement, as it was a year before the publication of Noah Worcester's "Solemn Review of the Custom of War." It was at the time that David L. Dodge and his friends in New York were considering the formation of their New York Peace Society, and it would be interesting to learn whether there was any connection between the two things.

The "Complaint of Peace" is dedicated to Philip of Burgundy, the Bishop of Utrecht; and the bishop's letter acknowledging it is dated December 6, 1517. In the dedication of his work to the bishop, Erasmus says: "You and I have lately seen that certain persons, much more formidable to their friends and fellow-countrymen than to any enemy, have left nothing unattempted to prevent the final cessation of war; and in another case we have seen with what difficulty those who were real friends to their country and king could lately obtain that peace which is always desirable and in the present conjuncture necessary. It was this shameful behavior which induced me to write my 'Complaint of Peace.'"

The intimation here that what men like William of Ciervia and John Sylvagius were working for in connection with the Congress of Kings at Cambray was "the final cessation of war," together with the whole spirit of the discussion of the "momentous business" in the letter of Erasmus quoted above, shows that what was really in mind was something vastly more ambitious and constructive than a mere treaty or anything which we usually associate with what actually happened at Cambray in 1517. In a letter to Ammonius, December 29, 1516 (the letter can be found in the second volume of Nichols's edition of Erasmus's letters), Erasmus says: "They say that before long there is to be a meeting of sovereigns—that is to say, Maximilian, the King of France, and our King Charles, at Cambray, when the question of an inviolable peace is to be considered." We know that the sovereigns did not meet at Cambray as proposed, but a treaty was concluded by their representatives there, March 11, 1517. This, however, was clearly something quite incommensurate with the "Grand Design" of William of Ciervia, John Sylvagius, and, I think it is fair to surmise, Erasmus himself. The whole matter is something which I wish we knew much more about than

the histories tell us. It is doubly interesting in this year 1907, when the movement for the organization of the world has proceeded so far that we are witnessing the meeting, in the capital of Erasmus's own country, of the first true Parliament of Man; and when the corner-stone has just been laid there of the Temple of Peace, the palace of the World Court, presented to the united world by a citizen of the United States. It is certainly significant, in view of the "momentous business" now being transacted in Holland, that it was the Dutch Erasmus who framed the first great impeachment of war in modern times, and the Dutch Grotius who a century later did the greatest work for peace which has ever been achieved by any single man.

The "Great Design" of John Sylvagius and his friends, whatever it was, came to nothing. The "Great Design" of Henry of Navarre had a strong element of selfishness in it: its primary motive was to effect a combination against the House of Austria. The first clearly conceived and at the same time really disinterested design for an organized world was William Penn's "Essay Toward the Peace of Europe." Most philosophic of all the founders of our American commonwealths, William Penn, publishing his great tractate after his return to England, did not forget to pay tribute to the "Great Design" of the French king; nor did he forget that the Dutch Republic had in modern times furnished the most impressive illustration of that great principle of federation whose extension to international affairs it was the purpose of his work to urge.

High on the great tower over the Philadelphia which he founded, and where by happy augury was organized this federal nation of brotherly love, Penn's statue stands, so colossal that its outline is clear against the sky. He is not looking toward the West, as he fittingly might do, contemplating the growth of the republic which he helped to birth. More fittingly still, he is looking toward England and Europe, beyond the sea. To-day he is our symbol, speaking for us to the world, declaring to Europe, to the august Parliament of Man assembled in the land of Hugo Grotius and Erasmus, that America in this great hour is not chiefly looking inward, but outward; in our behalf pledging the nations that the United States will do her part for the high interests of the united world.

BOSTON, MASS.

The Neutralization of the Philippines as a Peace Measure.

From the recent Annual Address of Moorfield Storey, President of the Anti-Imperialist League of Boston.

* * * * *

An argument which has influenced strongly the people of this country has been the fear that if we left the Islands, some other power would seize them. Though England once conquered them and returned them to Spain, and though we have found them a poor possession, it is believed that other nations covet them and would take them if we gave them up. This is a danger to be guarded against, and fortunately it can be dealt with easily. The weak powers of Europe, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxemburg have had their independence secured for years by international treaty which makes them neutral territory. They are withdrawn from attack and spoliation,

and each nation is satisfied to let them live as independent so long as no other nation can take them. Norway, whose waters might make her desired by some naval power, now seeks the protection of a similar treaty, and will doubtless get it. The question now is whether Sweden shall be asked to sign it.

A treaty with England, Germany, France, Japan, and perhaps other powers, can be made, which would in like manner neutralize the Philippines. These nations will be satisfied if they can be assured that no one else will get the Islands. Thus the natives, protected from foreign aggression and saved from the expense of armies and navies, will be allowed to develop in peace. Not only does this benefit them, not only is it a great contribution to the cause of peace which all nations profess to desire, but it is a distinct advantage to us. Why is it that the President recently said, "We cannot afford as a nation to cultivate the gentler qualities," and bade us keep "our fighting edge?" Why is our fleet at enormous expense sent to the Pacific? Why are we asked to pay for more monstrous battleships and more guns? Why are we proposing to spend enormous sums to fortify the Islands themselves? Is it not because the Philippines are an exposed spot which we feel bound to defend, and we wish to show the world that we can do it? Neutralize the Islands, and all expense for fortifying them is at once saved, all the ships which it would take to hold them become unnecessary. The temptation to seize them is removed and no war for their possession is possible. Are not these great benefits?

We have neutralized the Great Lakes so that neither the United States nor England maintains either fort or soldier or man-of-war upon them. Imagine, if this had not been done, what forts would have frowned on the opposing shores? What magazines would have been built and filled with munitions of war? What navies would have floated on these waters? What sums would have been wrung from the people by taxation? And, worse than all, what chances for collision? What possibility of war would always have been present to our minds? Would we for a moment reverse this beneficent policy? Why not apply it to the Philippines? Why not now, while we have the opportunity, make these Islands, like our lakes, an area from which war is excluded? Is it not worth while to try?

With no outlying dependencies to defend, we are vastly freer from danger than England, upon whose shores no enemy has planted his foot for centuries. Wide oceans on each side of our territory and millions of men at command are protection enough.

The President's statement is appalling. If this great country, with its wonderful resources, its great and growing population, and all its elements of strength, "cannot afford to cultivate the softer virtues," what nation can? What becomes of the Christian doctrines that we profess? Are they wrong? If the clergy of this country, instead of becoming excited because the words "In God We Trust" are left off our coins, were to preach the faith which these words express, were to insist that the moral principles of Christianity are truths to be believed and practiced by nations as well as by men, and were to throw their influence against the insane expenditure for ships and warfare in which the great powers are now competing with each other until

the point of exhaustion is almost reached, they would do more for their church and their country than by devotion to words that express a belief which they do not maintain. Civilization is advanced by a sincere love of justice and respect for the rights of other men, not by a "fighting edge." Unless such words are rebuked, this country may yet pay through a terrible war with some foreign power the penalty of its Philippine conquest, as we paid with the Civil War for the crime of slavery. Neutralization is a way out of these dangers.

The next step is to make the definite declaration that we propose to give the Philippines their independence so that the world may know our purpose. In the words so familiar to every American boy: "Set before them the glorious object of entire independence and it will breathe into them anew the breath of life."

This done, with Americans and Filipinos working in cordial harmony to make independence an accomplished fact, the rest is easy. "Where there is a will there is a way." Let them organize their government and take over the control of their affairs. They would doubtless, until the experiment had succeeded, welcome the presence at their capital of an American adviser who could help them in dealing with difficult questions, and who, understanding the situation, would protect them from misrepresentation in the United States. As our advice, our colleges, our friendship have helped to make Japan the powerful nation that it is, we may by like methods aid the Philippines.

We must not be alarmed by disorder if it comes. We have known our own rebellions and riots, small and great, and through them have made our way to power and freedom. Every independent nation has advanced by struggles and conflicts to established peace. At their worst the contests of Filipinos could not be more destructive than those which have marked and marred our occupation, nor would they be worse than the "very peaceful" conditions which the American orator at Manila proposed to establish by "one hundred thousand American troops." They make a solitude and call it "peace." "Order reigns in Warsaw." The language of tyranny is the same in all ages.

The way out is easy. The way on is beset with difficulties, dangers, demoralization. Is it so difficult to choose? Our past may yet be forgiven if we show the courage to abide by our own principles and leave an independent nation as a monument of our forbearance and wisdom, thereby setting an example to the world at a time when such examples are sorely needed. When physical power is worshipped as it is to-day and the strong nations are harrying the weak, we shall do well to remember the striking words of Lowell: "Moral supremacy is the only supremacy which leaves monuments and not ruins behind it."

New Books.

STIMMEN UND GESTALTEN. By Bertha von Suttner. Leipzig: B. Elischer, Nachfolger. Paper covers, 202 pages. Price, 4 marks. Cloth, 5½ marks.

To those who read German this new work from the pen of the distinguished peace leader, the Baroness von Suttner, will be most welcome. It is a collection of